

## **EXHIBIT 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In December 1999, Respondent Naresh Kamboj was appointed to the California Commission on Aging. Respondent's position is designated in the conflict of interest code for the Department of Aging. As a designated employee, Respondent was required to file a statement of economic interests within 30 days of assuming office. Respondent failed to timely file his assuming office statement, which was due on or before January 31, 2000.

The Enforcement Division handled this case under the SEI Expedited Procedures Program adopted by the Fair Political Practices Commission in July 1999.

For purposes of this Stipulation, the violation of the Political Reform Act (the "Act")<sup>1</sup> is as follows:

**COUNT 1:** As a designated employee of the Department of Aging, Respondent failed to timely file an assuming office statement of economic interests due on or before January 31, 2000, in violation of Government Code section 87300.

**RESPONDENT:** Naresh Kamboj

### **SUMMARY OF THE LAW**

An express purpose of the Act, as set forth in Section 81002, subdivision (c), is to assure that the assets and income of public officials, which may be materially affected by their official actions, be disclosed, so that conflicts of interest may be avoided. In furtherance of this purpose, Section 87300 requires every agency to adopt and promulgate a conflict of interest code.

Section 87302, subdivision (a), requires an agency's conflict of interest code to designate the employees of the agency who must file statements of economic interests, in which they disclose their reportable investments, business positions, interests in real property, and income. Under Section 87302, subdivision (b), an agency's conflict of interest code must require every new designated employee to file an assuming office statement of economic interests within 30 days of assuming office.

Section 87300 declares that an agency's conflict of interest code shall have the force of law, and any violation of the code is deemed a violation of the Act.

### **SUMMARY OF THE FACTS**

Respondent Naresh Kamboj is a member of the California Commission on Aging. The Commission on Aging has 25 members, and is the principal advisory body to the Governor and

---

<sup>1</sup> The Political Reform Act is contained in Government Code sections 81000 through 91014. All statutory references are to the Government Code unless otherwise indicated. Commission regulations appear at Title 2, California Code of Regulations, sections 18109-18996.

State Legislature on issues affecting older individuals. Respondent became a member of the Commission on Aging in December 1999. The Department of Aging lists Respondent as a designated employee in its conflict of interest code. As a designated employee, Respondent was required to file a statement of economic interests (“SEI”) within 30 days of assuming office. Respondent failed to timely file his assuming office SEI by the January 31, 2000 due date.

The Fair Political Practices Commission contacted Respondent several times regarding his failure to file the SEI. On June 21, 2000, the Technical Assistance Division sent the Respondent a notice regarding his duty to file the SEI. On October 6, 2000, the Technical Assistance Division sent a second notice to Respondent reminding him of his filing obligation.

On November 30, 2000, Investigator Bill Motmans of the Enforcement Division called the Respondent and directed him to file the SEI. Respondent told Investigator Motmans that he was aware of his legal obligation and that he would file the SEI. Respondent did not file the assuming office SEI until counsel from the Enforcement Division contacted him in May 2001.

### **CONCLUSION**

This matter consists of one count, which carries a maximum possible penalty of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000).

Under the Commission’s SEI Expedited Procedures Program, the usual administrative fine for a non-filer who promptly files a delinquent SEI after being contacted by an Enforcement Division attorney is between Four Hundred and Six Hundred Dollars (\$400 - \$600). The facts of this case justify imposing the agreed upon penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500).